IPEA
EPO
D-80298 Munich
Germany

11 April 2005

Dear Sirs

PCT/G2004/002477
Our ref: Auto Behave Mods

Thank you for the Written Opinion of the ISA.

The Written Opinion cites 2 category X documents against the independent claims:

D1	US 6418309
D2	US 6457132

In light of the citations, the applicant files replacement pages as follows:

Replacement pages 3 – 6 and 10 - 12 to replace the same pages as originally filed

Triplicate copies will follow by post, together with one set marked to show all changes.

Amended Claim 1 now reads:

1.   A method of enabling a wireless information device to automatically modify its behaviour, comprising the steps of:
    (a)   an end-user entering time sensitive information into a first application running on the device;
    (b)   a second application running on the device receiving data from the first application, the data relating to the time sensitive information, and the second application then automatically changing the behaviour of the device appropriately in dependence on the data;

in which the first application sends the data indirectly to the second application via an intermediary server.

The amended claim differs from the original claim in including the highlighted text, taken from original Claim 7. Now novelty or inventive step objections were raised against original Claim 7 and indeed none of the citations disclose or suggest this approach.

We note that the examiner raised a clarity objection against the term 'server'. As now stated in the Summary of the Invention section:

"The term 'server' is used in its normal, broad sense to mean a computer program that provides services to other computer programs."

This conforms to the primary meaning of a 'server'. For example, the web-based technical dictionary Whatis.com gives the following as the primary meaning:

"1) In information technology, a server is a computer program that provides services to other computer programs (and their users) in the same or other computers."

In the light of the above arguments and amendments, re-consideration of the present application is requested. Should the examiner require further clarification, a further Written Opinion is requested.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Langley